



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/722,834 | 11/26/2003 | Dar-Shyang Lee | 15358-008700 | 8170 |

20350 7590 02/14/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2141

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

02/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/722,834 | Applicant(s) LEE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner NICHOLAS R. TAYLOR | Art Unit 2141 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NICHOLAS R. TAYLOR.

(3) Sujit B. Kotwal, Reg. 43,336.

(2) Quang Nguyen.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 11 February 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chiu, King.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed and clarified the inventive concept as both claimed and described in the specification. Applicant further discussed the differences between the prior art of Chiu and the claimed invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jason Cardone/ SPE 2145/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required